

TEST RESULTS



Opel/Vauxhall Corsa

RATING	SCORE
 ADULT OCCUPANT 	N/A
 PEDESTRIAN 	N/A Pre 2002 rating

Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver



Frontal impact passenger



Side impact driver

	GOOD
	ADEQUATE
	MARGINAL
	WEAK
	POOR

Child restraints

18 month old Child	None fitted
3 year old Child	Britax Supercruiser, forward facing

Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

Safety equipment

Front seatbelt pretensioners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front seatbelt load limiters	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driver frontal airbag	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front passenger frontal airbag	<input type="checkbox"/>
Side body airbags	<input type="checkbox"/>
Side head airbags	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driver knee airbag	<input type="checkbox"/>

Car details

Hand of drive	RHD
Tested model	Opel Corsa 1.2LS
Body type	3 door hatchback
Year of publication	1997
Kerb weight	874

Comments

The Vauxhall Corsa was awarded two stars for protection in frontal and side impact. The car might have been awarded three stars if the passenger head had not struck the top of the facia. The new frontal impact criteria were all met, with the exception of the passenger head protection and the rearward and upward movement of the steering wheel. In frontal impact, the major problems related to intrusion. However, the passenger compartment retained its stability. Protection from the left knee-impact area was good but on the right there was scope for improvement. Protection in the footwell could also be improved. There were no major deficiencies in side-impact protection but general improvement would be desirable.

Front impact

There was moderate deformation of the passenger compartment, which maintained its structural stability. Rearward and upward intrusion of the steering wheel was limited – the wheel moved 127mm horizontally and 129mm vertically – but intrusion of the footwell was excessive. The driver's door provided support sufficient to ensure there was only limited collapse of the door aperture Δ after the impact, both doors opened normally. However, the loading through the door moved the centre pillar rearwards, allowing moderate intrusion of the facia. On the basis of the dummy's recordings, head protection was good although the limited rearward and vertical movement of the steering wheel meant this assessment had to be downrated to adequate. Neck protection was recorded as good. Because of the moderate facia intrusion in frontal impact, the adequate rating recorded for the seat belt loading on the driver's chest provided by the dummy's instruments was downrated to a protection level of marginal. Protection of the driver's left upper leg was good – the dummy's knee lightly impacted on the steering column cover. On the right side, however, the knee hit the fuse box cover which was supported by a strut and

tubular bar. Protection was downrated to poor since further penetration on this side would have resulted in sharply increased loads. Despite excessive intrusion of the footwell into the passenger compartment, protection of both lower legs was assessed as adequate. For feet and ankles, the Corsa gave marginal protection. The passenger's head impacted on the top of the fascia and the protection level was assessed as poor. Since this result was worse than that for the driver, it was used in calculating the overall protection rating in frontal and side impact. Protection of the passenger's right upper leg was found to be weak. Protection of the chest and lower legs was assessed as adequate. There was good protection of the passenger's neck, left upper leg and also the feet and ankles.

Side impact

Head protection was good. Loading on the dummy's top rib meant chest protection was adequate, while protection from injury in the abdomen area was assessed as weak. An instrumentation failure resulted in no data being available to assess pelvis protection. However, information supplied by the manufacturer indicated that the ratings would have been within the range adequate to weak. Within this range, the overall rating for the car would not vary.

Child occupant

A forward-facing Britax Supercruiser child seat was recommended by Vauxhall. The forward movement of the child restraint under frontal impact was well controlled. However, there was insufficient restraint of the child's upper body which allowed a large forward movement of the head. The head rebounded to hit the rear seat backrest outside the child restraint. In the side-impact crash test, the lateral movement of the child restraint was found to be poor, with the upper part of the restraint being able to move across as far as the mid line of the car. The child's head was then allowed to move just beyond the protective sides of the child restraint.

Pedestrian

Child head impact All of the test points gave worse-than-average protection. These points corresponded to areas of the bonnet above the battery, suspension turret, oil filter cap, air cleaner, a hose clip and brake fluid reservoir. **Upper leg impact** All three test points provided worse-than-average protection. These were at the centre of the car by the bonnet latch, above the centre of the headlight and in line with the inside edge of the headlight. **Adult head impact** One of the test points provided protection better than that required for proposed legislation. This point was on the scuttle ahead of the windscreen. The other two test sites gave better than average protection. **Leg impact** Worse-than-average protection was provided at all three test points on the bumper: at its centre, in line with the towing eye and in line with the inside edge of the headlight.